Citizen Advisory Committee
Meeting - October 1, 2001

What are your expectations for the process?

1. Response to issues.
2. Agreements of the committee will be implemented.
3. Find common ground.
4. Meaningful.
5. Interact with technical advisory group.
6. Learn more about mercury in the environment.
7. Take time necessary to deal with issues.
8. Follow Natural Resources Board direction.
9. Avoid polarization.
10. Recommendations fit environmental impact.
11. Set a firm foundation for a common understanding of how the process will work.
12. Lay the groundwork for future meetings.
13. Learning how the group will move forward and do its work and interact with the technical advisory group.
14. Clear idea of what the process will be and timeline.
15. Build relationships with each other.

What issues would the committee like to see in their report to Secretary Bazzell?

1. Multipollutant control option.
2. Ways of measuring success.
3. Impact on electricity bills.
4. Assessment of environmental impacts of the rule.
5. Identification of mercury control technologies that are available today.
6. Monitoring, reassessing and verification methods.
7. Unresolved issues.
8. The impact of emission caps on industrial growth.
9. Comparison of proposed rules and federal MACT for utilities.
10. Criteria for setting mercury reduction levels.
11. Agreed schedule of reductions.
12. Human health and environmental costs.
13. Cost and benefits of control.
14. Impact of proposed rules on fish advisories.
15. Impact on electric reliability, fuel mix and energy costs.
16. Best estimate of the environmental improvement from the complete success of implementing the proposed rules.
17. To what extent does the Citizen Advisory Committee need to address electric reliability?
18. What is the economic cost to the state (i.e. tourism) from having mercury contaminated lakes?
19. What is the cost to the state if mercury rules are not implemented?

20. Future mercury research agenda and budget.
21. Potential economic costs to the state to implement mercury rules.
22. Why do we need phased mercury reductions?
23. Evaluate federal and other states' programs and proposals.
24. Allocate the costs and benefits.
25. Why trading? How does mercury product collection program relate to hot spots analysis?
26. How should we address new sources?
27. What impacts might the proposed rules have on the emissions of other pollutants – e.g. SO2, NOx? Are there other environmental impacts associated with the implementation of this proposal?
28. Establish methods and procedures for the mercury product collection program.
29. Insure that mercury product collection program in the proposed rules fits with new water quality regulations.
30. Review methodology for baseline determination.
31. Establish mercury emission summary for Wisconsin.
32. Relationship between early retirement and meeting rule provisions.
33. Clarify variance procedures.
34. Evaluate the infrastructure changes required to support fuel switching.
35. Evaluate the timing of periodic reports.
36. Establish how credit for early reductions could be secured for achieving federal regulations.
37. What are the implications for no or limited actions on a state or national level.
38. What are the impacts on human health if no action is taken – i.e. damaged brains.

What information does the committee want from the technical group?

1. Better understanding of the science of mercury deposition.
2. What is the role of sediment bound mercury in fish contamination?
3. What are the mercury contributions from local and regional sources?
4. What is the technical expertise of advisory group members?
5. What is the schedule for the work of the technical advisory group?
6. Evaluation of currently available mercury control technologies.
7. What are the sources of mercury deposition in Wisconsin's lakes?
8. What are the implications of no action and waiting for the federal MACT?
9. Are there any national experts that should be involved in their efforts?
10. How did USEPA develop their recommendation on the acceptable dose/exposure for fish consumption advisories?
11. Best estimate of the results of proposed rules if fully implemented.
12. What is the safe dose/exposure for wildlife?
13. To what extent will the technical advisory group "farm out" questions to experts in the field so as to get the most up-to-date objective answers?
14. How much time does the technical advisory group need?
15. Skeptical about the expertise, objectivity and credibility of the members of the technical group.
16. Cost and benefit analysis of the provisions of the proposed regulation.